



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,803	06/07/2001	Larry Scott Crump	CCP-3358(1)	5347
22202	7590	04/30/2004	EXAMINER	
WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S C			FISCHER, JUSTIN R	
555 EAST WELLS STREET			ART UNIT	
SUITE 1900			PAPER NUMBER	
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			1733	

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/681,803

Applicant(s)

CRUMP ET AL.

Examiner

Justin R Fischer

Art Unit

1733

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_


Claim(s) rejected: 1-19 and 34.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_


8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1733

**Continuation of 5:** As correctly pointed out by applicant, Cordts expressly suggests bi-directional curing can be used via the arrangement of a first and second radiation source below and above the mold, respectively. While applicant contends that the inventive staggered arrangement provides unexpected results, the inventive staggered arrangement was not compared to the closest prior art in which the first and second radiation sources are not staggered (such an arrangement is suggested by Cordts). Regarding Costello and Aiba, the references generally recognize that it is known to stagger radiation sources when more than one radiation source is provided. In this instance, as noted above, Cordts expressly suggests the use of multiple radiation sources below and above a mold. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to stagger the radiation sources in view of Costello and Aiba absent any conclusive showing of unexpected results. It is further noted that the inclusion of a radiation source below and above a mold is seen to necessarily produce some cure gradient across the thickness of the gel coat (first and second surfaces of gel coat would be exposed to radiation source prior to the center of the gel coat). Also, it appears that any sequential bi-directional cure will necessarily establish a cure gradient since the first radiation source (for example from below) will cure the surface adjacent the mold to a larger extent as compared to the center or the surface exposed to the environment.

  
Justin Fischer

April 27, 2004

  
JEFF H. AFTERGUT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300